ļ	
1	CITY OF NORTH CANTON, OHIO
2	
3	
4	IN RE:
5	NORTH CANTON)
6	COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE) VIRTUAL MEETING)
7) TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	Transcript of Proceedings held virtually before
13	North Canton City Council, taken by the undersigned,
14	Shannon Roberts, a Registered Professional Reporter
15	and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio, at the
16	offices of North Canton City Hall, 145 North Main
17	Street, North Canton, Ohio, on Monday, the 3rd day of
18	May, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.
19	
20	
21	<u> </u>
22	
23	
24	Premier Court Reporting Canton 330.492.4221 Akron 330.928.1418
25	www.premierreporters.com

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	Daryl Revoldt, Member
4	Douglas Foltz, Member
5	Stephanie Werren, Member
6	Mark Cerreta, Member
7	Dominic Fonte, Member
8	Matthew Stroia, Member
9	Stephan B. Wilder, Mayor
10	Patrick DeOrio, Director of Administration
11	Catherine Farina, Deputy Director of Administration
12	Jina Alaback, Director of Finance
13	Robert Graham, PE
14	Martin B. Van Gundy, IV, Chief Building Officer
15	Benjamin Young, Council Clerk
16	
	Jamie McCleaster, Planning Commission
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	MR. YOUNG: When you are ready, sir.
2	MR. REVOLDT: Are we set? Let's go.
3	Good evening, everyone. This is Council
4	Vice-President Daryl Revoldt presiding this
5	evening. I'd like to call our Council of
6	Whole meeting to order.
7	Clerk, would you please call the roll?
8	MR. YOUNG: Member Revoldt.
9	MR. REVOLDT: Present.
10	MR. YOUNG: Member Stroia.
11	MR. STROIA: Here.
12	MR. YOUNG: Member Cerreta.
13	MR. CERRETA: Cerreta is here.
14	MR. YOUNG: Member Foltz.
15	MR. FOLTZ: Here.
16	MR. YOUNG: Member Fonte.
17	MR. FONTE: Here.
18	MR. YOUNG: Member Werren.
19	MS. WERREN: Here.
20	MR. YOUNG: And Member Peters could not
21	join us today. Six present.
22	MR. REVOLDT: Very good. Thank you. May
23	I have a motion to excuse Member Peters?
24	MR. FOLTZ: Foltz moves.
25	MS. WERREN: Werren, second.

1	MR. REVOLDT: All in favor, say "aye."
2	MR. FOLTZ: Aye.
3	MR. REVOLDT: Aye.
4	MR. CERRETA: Aye.
5	MS. WERREN: Aye.
6	MR. FONTE: Aye.
7	MR. STROIA: Aye.
8	MR. REVOLDT: Opposed?
9	(No response.)
10	MR. REVOLDT: Motion carries. Very good.
11	Let's move on to our agenda. The first item
12	is community and economic development. Our
13	Second Century Zoning went to the Planning
14	Commission for a discussion. You have before
15	you a capture of those discussion points.
16	Planning Commission Chairman Jamie
17	McCleaster, he is on with us tonight if we
18	have any if we have any questions for him.
19	But what we tried to do was capture the
20	items that came up at the Planning Commission
21	meeting. The Planning Commission did approve
22	the document, but it had some suggestions.
23	And so what I'd like to do tonight is to roll
24	through these to determine whether Council
25	wishes to make any further amendments to the

existing document.

2.0

Let me preface that action by a reminder that the goal of our zoning amendment, our zoning plan, is to promote a higher level of commercial activity in -- on Main Street.

And our objective is to increase property -- property tax values and the number of jobs.

And as we have often discussed, what we are trying to do is maximize the use of commercially-zoned property, a space that is not likely in the future to grow, given the proximity to residential neighborhoods.

So having said that, let's -- let's begin. The first item that came up was a question about adding hotels and funeral homes to the Main Street Center District. I don't believe that that -- those are -- are good permitted uses. Funeral homes tend to be fairly -- require a fair amount of real estate for parking, et cetera. We have had a funeral home in the central district, and it had parking issues.

Correspondingly, I'm not sure that hotels at this time are desirable for a variety of reasons. But to wit, if the -- if a hotel is

permitted, it is built and is unsuccessful, it really creates a burden on the community to find a second use or another use for that site.

So is there anyone who would -- who would like to add anything to that or take a contrary view? And Patrick --

MR. DEORIO: I would add --

MR. REVOLDT: And Patrick and the Mayor, please go ahead and let -- Dom, before we go, let me ask the administration I guess if it wants to weigh in.

MR. DEORIO: Yeah, I would stand to agree with that premise that it's not really a good maximizing use of the -- of the limited commercial space. I mean, if we look to other communities around here in Stark County in which they have had, say, funeral homes in the downtown area, eventually they have all been pushed out.

You know, in Massillon, Arnold used to be downtown. It got pushed out to Wales Road.

And, you know, there used to be one in downtown Canton, Lewis. You know, they just -- they just can't compete with the

nature of the types of -- of funerals these days. And as a result, they require -- it's just a huge amount of -- of space. You take a look at the one we've got over on Pittsburg with Reed; huge amount of space. I can't imagine that space on Main Street. And there is very -- you know, there are not really a lot of jobs that go with it.

And then on the hotels, it's the same story. I mean, you know, you don't have to look much further than downtown Canton and see that, you know, over the last 30 years how they have struggled, you know, to keep, you know, some type of a hotel down there. And, you know, were it not for in the early days of, you know, some of the more established companies reserving entire floors, keeping it open, or, you know, the Hall of Fame, of late, it -- it begs the question of whether or not it can really survive.

I mean, look at here and proximity to Belden Village. I mean, that's really where the hotel action is. So we don't think that it would be an appropriate use.

1	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Let's turn it over
2	to Council. Dominic, I think you are first
3	up. Am I correct?
4	MR. FONTE: Okay. So I'm good with what
5	you are saying. I mean, the only problem to
6	have a hotel
7	THE REPORTER: Wait. Wait.
8	Dominic, I'm having trouble understanding
9	you, hearing you.
10	MR. FONTE: Here, hold on one sec. So
11	can you hear me? It's Dominic.
12	MR. REVOLDT: Yes.
13	THE REPORTER: That's better.
14	MR. FONTE: Okay. Sorry about that.
15	THE REPORTER: Thank you.
16	MR. FONTE: What I was suggesting is the
17	funeral parlor I agree with. There is a
18	small funeral home on South Main, Vrabel
19	Vrabel. I think that's how you pronounce it,
20	Vrabel.
21	MR. REVOLDT: Vrabel, yes.
22	MR. FONTE: Yep. And then, of course,
23	the one on you know, the one that takes up
24	the big parking space over there on
25	Pittsburg. So, yeah, I agree with that.

1 And as far as the hotel goes, to do a 2 fresh space, that would take up a good bit of 3 real estate, as well, unless they retrofitted the residential into that, where the -- where 4 the Hoover District was, you know. But other 5 than that, I agree with those items. 6 7 MR. REVOLDT: You know, Dominic -- and I -- this is Daryl again. You know, as I 8 told Jamie in a side conversation that we 9 had, you know, this is -- while we are trying 10 11 to set some guidelines for development in the 12 community, this is not cast in stone. 13 a really good opportunity came up down the 14 road, we can always bring it back and change 15 it, and it can be done with some speed. 16 So okay. Let's move on. Is there anyone 17 else who wants to weigh in on the hotel/funeral home issue? 18 19 (No response.) 20 MR. REVOLDT: Okay. We're going to leave 21 that out then, if I don't hear anything else. 22 On 1136.09, design standards, the Planning Commission asked us to consider a 23

provision for permitting similar-looking

materials to the natural materials that we

24

1	specified. In other words, there are
2	architectural products that are as good as
3	natural.
4	How does Council feel about that? Or,
5	excuse me, let me go to the administration
6	first and then Council.
7	MR. DEORIO: I think it's a good
8	suggestion.
9	MR. REVOLDT: Okay.
10	MR. DEORIO: I think it ties into the
11	spirit of what I think I had heard from
12	Member Cerreta. You know, we talked about
13	the fencing type of thing. But as it applies
14	to buildings, that would be an appropriate
15	it would be an appropriate substitute,
16	natural looking.
17	MAYOR WILDER: Daryl Daryl, Mayor
18	Wilder.
19	MR. REVOLDT: Yes, Mayor.
20	MAYOR WILDER: I think what we are
21	looking for is a sense of consistency with
22	the facades and the building structures. I
23	think that is the spirit of the of what we
24	are trying to look at here. And so I
25	would I would agree that if there is

quality and similar building materials that will, you know, stay with kind of the theme we have along Main Street here, I think that's appropriate.

MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Very good. Council?
Mark?

MR. CERRETA: Yeah, I totally agree with that. I think it was a good suggestion they made. Like Pat said, it does go along -- it doesn't have to be truly wrought iron. It could be something that looks like that; it's less expensive. You know, there are a lot of different facade stones that aren't really stone, but they look just like stone. So when we say stone, you know, that doesn't -- that pushes the cost up.

So similar-looking material. There is some new stuff that's on there they mentioned. So I think that's a really good idea. I do think, though, that we need to do a little better job of coming together on -- and what -- we talked about this, what are we suggesting to try to keep our theme, especially in the center stage of the -- of the whole district, the center district --

MR. REVOLDT: Yes.

MR. CERRETA: -- we want to call it historic district.

MR. REVOLDT: Yes.

MR. CERRETA: So I know we went down through this. But how do we get people to look at these suggestions and, you know, possibly, you know, do these things. And that's another conversation. We don't need to have that now.

MR. REVOLDT: Yeah.

MR. CERRETA: But I -- you have that right in front of you here, all these yellow things. You know, and I understand it, when we say -- when we say Hoover brick, when we say natural cut stone, okay, that's -- that can be, you know, kind of open. There is a -- the Hoover brick is an actual color, actually, but natural cut stone, there are a lot of different kinds of stone that look natural. And, you know, different masonry kind of things. So we probably need to -- to get a better hold of this. This is a good list here. I'm not going to sit here and go down the whole thing. But that's my comments

on that.

MR. FONTE: Mark, it's Dom. It's Dominic

Fonte. Mark --

MR. CERRETA: I know.

MR. FONTE: So you know how they have like HardieBacker board and WonderBoard and different things that is -- it looks like real wood or cedar, and then they have the fiberglass product, Fypon, or whatever they want to call it, that people use for trim and it's maintenance free. And it's a poly product, but it looks really good. So, yeah, I agree.

So a lot of times what they would do is what's called an architectural review board or have like somebody that's a little handy on the staff, or contracted, to sort of like make these decisions, so that it's not so literal. You know, we have to have that wiggle room, like you said, with the cut stone, being no -- not real stone, or real wrought iron, but the look alike stuff, to help the people trying to construct these things save money and also keep the esthetics of the City like what we want.

1	MR. REVOLDT: Let's let's do this
2	then, Marty and the administration, if you
3	would add some language to and work with
4	Ben to add some things add some language
5	that permits design standards similar to
6	natural materials. If we can get some
7	language included there, that would be
8	helpful. So I guess we are kind of a yes,
9	and then we'll circle back
10	MR. DEORIO: I think that's in there,
11	though.
12	MR. YOUNG: That language is on page 11
13	of your packet.
14	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Very good. All
15	right.
16	MR. STROIA: I think that's smart.
17	Because there are there are new things
18	that come out, it seems like every other
19	year. So if you say just like you just said
20	it, Daryl, natural, I think that that kind
21	of covers a lot.
22	MR. REVOLDT: Well, let me ask you a
23	question. If this is drafted on item 6, do
24	you want wood grain textured vinyl siding?
25	MR. STROIA: I don't know that that

1	specifically needs to be in there, because
2	there could be something that
3	MR. DEORIO: That's on trim.
4	MR. STROIA: is more encompassing than
5	that. That's the trim part?
6	MR. DEORIO: You've got to read the whole
7	thing.
8	MR. REVOLDT: I am.
9	MR. FONTE: They have good products,
10	guys.
11	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. All right. Then
12	we'll just then let's put let's insert
13	this language then. If everybody is
14	comfortable with it, let's use it.
15	MR. STROIA: Yep. Sounds good.
16	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Let's move on to
17	1136.11. This was a parking question. Thank
18	you, Ben. There was concern about parking,
19	and not using not specifying sort of
20	minimum required parking. In the course of
21	the discussion, I think what what
22	we try have tried to avoid is an arbitrary
23	number of parking spots.
24	As you drive around town, particularly on
25	Main Street, you'll notice that there is a

huge amount of unused asphalt that was --1 2 spots were required. They are unused. It's -- it's -- it's wasting space that could 3 4 be used for something else. So kind of my take on it is I think we 5 6 should leave it -- leave it to the property 7 owner to make that determination. Administration, you want to weigh in? 8 9 MR. DEORIO: Yeah, Daryl. I've spent a lot of time driving up and down Main Street, 10 11 and, you know, again, just doing it over the 12 weekend, and I would concur, to me, at times Main Street looks like a giant parking lot 13 with some incidental businesses on it. And 14 it used to be kind of the other way around. 15 And I do believe that we have gotten 16 17 ourselves into a situation where we have 18 over-regulated the amount of parking 19 necessary, because of some arbitrary bias 20 number that we had. 21 And we don't know how many parking spots 22 is needed for the North Canton Shoe Repair or

is needed for the North Canton Shoe Repair or for Pav's or for whoever. But I know one thing, that if it -- you know, the market will decide how much space is needed. And if

23

24

it's insufficient and to the -- to the point that the business can't survive, then the business has to relocate. That's the idea. They have outgrown their space. They move on.

So I -- I agree that there is a lot more uses that could be provided for some of this -- this empty space. And to the extent that, you know, when these lots are bought and consolidated and made into something else, I think this is where that will come into play. Nothing will really change on the existing footprint as it is. It's the idea that going forward, if we have the redevelopment that occurs, then we can take -- start to take that into account. For the most part, it's not going to change until redevelopment occurs.

MR. REVOLDT: And, candidly, Pat, it may involve -- and I think, for example, the -- the Acme site on North Main Street, the site on South Main that includes Ro's, I mean, as I look at those sites, there is room for -- for other buildings on those properties.

MR. DEORIO: Yeah.

MR. REVOLDT: And there would still be 1 2 adequate parking. MR. CERRETA: To -- to just kind of 3 4 piggyback on Pat there, I totally agree with that. I think maybe by doing this, too, 5 maybe it will help our -- our businesses work 6 7 with their neighboring businesses a little bit more. I mean, there are businesses that 8 are open in the daytime and they are closed 9 in the evening, right next to businesses that 10 11 are very busy in the evening. Well, let's 12 work -- have them make, you know, some kind 13 of agreement to share the parking in the afternoons when no one is around. That's 14 15 what a community is about. You bring in 16 business. Not everybody is concerned about 17 their particular property parking kind of 18 thing, but it's -- as long as it doesn't 19 interfere during their business hours, I 20 think that would be a -- more of a community 21 kind of feeling. That's excellent. 22 MR. DEORIO: Yeah. 23 MR. REVOLT: Dominic. 24 MR. FONTE: Yeah, I was just going to

say, Mark is right what he's saying; it's

1	just that everybody is too happy and afraid,
2	so you just have to have whole agreements
3	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Anyone else?
4	MR. STROIA: Supply and demand, I agree.
5	I mean, who knows better about the parking
6	situation than the person that's going to run
7	the business. So I think it's pretty
8	commonsense.
9	MR. REVOLDT: Yep. Okay.
10	MS. WERREN: Yeah. It's Stephanie. I
11	agree. Same thing; not going to repeat it.
12	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Perfect. Okay. So
13	we'll we'll let that one lie. I want to
14	say one thing. We had a I think Mark was
15	on and maybe Matt was on. We had a really
16	great conversation with the Planning
17	Commission on this. And there were a lot of
18	great ideas kicked around and everything.
19	And so I'm grateful, because the wonderful
20	thing about the Planning Commission doing
21	this is it was a second set of eyes that
22	hadn't been part of the original
23	conversation. And I think it was just
24	just a healthy process.
25	So having said that, let's move on to
	1

1	1136.17. This involves the use of the word
2	"decal," and what kind of signage we want on
3	a window and how much of the window can be
4	consumed by that sign. So do we have any
5	thoughts about this? Pat?
6	MR. DEORIO: Yeah, I think this should be
7	removed. I think I'm not sure how
8	it may have been an accidental slip-by. But,
9	you know, we know that in plazas that, you
10	know, have a door that, you know, leads in or
11	whatever, that they need something on their
12	door. And if to call it a decal or
13	whatever and restrict that so it's
14	practically unreadable even from, you know,
15	standing 20 feet away or something, that
16	that seems kind of onerous. So we would
17	be
18	MR. REVOLDT: Okay.
19	MR. DEORIO: okay with that.
20	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. So let's remove the
21	word "decal." And we'll see what what
22	happens there. Let's move on to anyone
23	else want to weigh in on that?
24	MAYOR WILDER: Just that I think we
25	Mayor Wilder here. I think just that

1 business owners should have the opportunity to put their name on their window or their 2 3 door, you know, in a legible, you know, way. 4 If -- if it's, you know, Dr. Doctor's office, 5 then they should have that opportunity to have their name plainly seen. So we are 6 7 talking basically about lettering. 8 MR. FONTE: I agree with the Mayor. 9 basically when you are walking up and down a 10 plaza or up the sidewalk, not necessarily 11 from the parking lot, but when you pull in 12 the parking space, get out and walk along, 13 you want to be able to read that. You are not going to read it from the back of the 14 15 parking lot. I think you want to be business 16 friendly and let them feel like they can do 17 what they can to get the exposure on what 18 their hours are. You know, now you might 19 want to put a size, you know, like it has to 20 be one inch or something like that, I guess. 21 MR. REVOLDT: Okay. So we'll -- go 22 ahead. I'm sorry. 23 MAYOR WILDER: Get rid of the decal. 24 MR. REVOLDT: Yep. Okay. Very good. 25 Let's move on to 1136.17, freestanding signs

for enter and exit. I think -- and I'm going to rely on Pat here, but the fact of the matter is enter and exit signs are not considered freestanding signs.

MR. DEORIO: Directional signage. This is -- you know, this is more like traffic signage.

MR. REVOLDT: Yes.

MR. DEORIO: Trying to enter here or loading docks this way or, you know -- the idea is -- with that is to try to make sure that there isn't some sort of confusion, you know, traffic pattern that causes a backup on a street or causes somebody to go a wrong way.

And I guess, you know, I would liken it to, say, out at the little league. You know, we recently followed up on the request, you know, from the Mayor and the Council regarding that additional drive throughput to the -- to the adjoining field. And if I -- if that was a private business and we put a sign there that says -- you know, at the bottom of that pull-in -- additional parking, with an arrow this way, that's a directional

1	sign. I'm not sure why we would need to
2	get why you want to get permission for
3	that.
4	MR. REVOLDT: Okay.
5	MR. CERRETA: I agree.
6	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. So we are going to
7	take no action. Does anyone else have
8	anything to add on that? Mark or anyone
9	else?
10	MR. CERRETA: No. I agree with Pat.
11	MR. FONTE: Yeah. So when you see that
12	sign you are discussing, you don't mean the
13	ones like in front of a business, like a
14	sandwich board or something?
15	MR. REVOLDT: No.
16	MR. DEORIO: No. We are talking about
17	directional signage.
18	MR. REVOLDT: We're talking about
19	directional signs.
20	MR. FONTE: Okay. Very good. Thanks.
21	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. So we'll take no
22	action on that.
23	1136.17(6), monument signs, we had a
24	request to add as a as a permitted
25	use a monument sign in the Main Street
	1

1	Center; make it conditional. That's
2	important. Conditional for large
3	developments. I think I in listening to
4	the discussion at the Planning Commission, I
5	understand the wisdom of doing this. I
6	believe and I don't want to put words in
7	the administration's mouth, but I think the
8	administration understands the wisdom of it.
9	MR. DEORIO: Yeah, I would caveat it by
10	saying, though, a lot of this is you know,
11	it's not so much what the business wants and
12	what the what the Council or
13	administration would allow. It's going to be
14	what the what the property owner wants to
15	allow
16	MR. REVOLDT: Yes.
17	MR. DEORIO: is going to be more of a
18	determinant there. But I agree with you that
19	for such a large development, that that is
20	fine.
21	MAYOR WILDER: I agree.
22	MR. REVOLDT: Does anyone have anything
23	to add? And, again, this is just in the Main
24	Street Center.
25	MR. CERRETA: Good suggestion. I agree

1	with that.
2	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. We will we will
3	make that change then.
4	We have a 1136.17, signs in general,
5	the Planning Commission thought that the Main
6	Street Center should not have electronic
7	signs. The reality is we have got them
8	already. We have got a couple churches that
9	have them. And
10	MR. DEORIO: And
11	MR. REVOLDT: Pardon?
12	MR. DEORIO: And a realtor.
13	MR. REVOLDT: And a realtor. I'm not
14	sure that we necessarily want to we want
15	to eliminate them on the Main Street
16	corridor. I'm sorry, I said Main Street
17	Center or in the Main Street Main
18	Street Center.
19	MR. FONTE: So are you saying, Daryl, you
20	are allowing them or not allowing them? What
21	are you saying?
22	MR. REVOLDT: We will allow them. We
23	will allow them.
24	MR. FONTE: Thank you.
25	MR. CERRETA: If I may

1	MR. REVOLDT: We went through we went
2	through I would remind Council, we went
3	through a large exercise to help to help
4	the church on South Main finally get their
5	their sign up. And it was it was a huge
6	lift to get it done. And I think we haven't
7	had any complaints about it. And it reflects
8	the sort of modern way the churches
9	communicate.
10	MR. CERRETA: I think in one of the other
11	sign things, though I don't think we took
12	it out, I don't believe. I mentioned it at
13	the Planning Commission. That we only allow
14	signs so so high anyways, and we only
15	allow
16	MR. REVOLDT: That's right.
17	MR. CERRETA: a certain percentage of
18	that height and width to be electronic. So
19	you this doesn't mean you can have one big
20	huge electric sign, if I'm not mistaken. It
21	has to be a percentage of the actual sign.
22	Am I am I mistaken in that?
23	MR. STROIA: You are right. You are
24	right, Mark.
25	MR. DEORIO: You're correct. Correct.

1	MR. CERRETA: So it can't just be so
2	those people who are getting all
3	getting starting to get upset because we
4	don't want these signs, it will be a
5	percentage of the of the electronics of
6	the total sign, which, in essence, it can't
7	be very big, because we only allow so many
8	signs to be so big anyways.
9	MR. REVOLDT: Right. Okay. Anyone have
10	anything else to add? Contrary review?
11	(No response.)
12	MR. REVOLDT: So I think we are going to
13	set that aside.
14	1136.21, recommended design, I think what
15	we were looking for was we wanted to
16	encourage people this goes to Mark's
17	earlier point we wanted them to pay
18	attention to esthetics without requiring it.
19	Does that capture it, Mark?
20	MR. CERRETA: Yeah. It's very hard, and
21	I think everyone agrees, to put down your
22	foot on what you should have. That's not us.
23	But we should be suggesting what we want to
24	be. We surely don't and I mentioned this
25	before. We surely don't want a big orange

1	building right downtown next to the you
. 2	know, the YMCA, and we don't want silver
3	brick or stone somewhere. We want to try to
4	keep the esthetics, especially, again, of the
5	central kind of historic area.
6	So somehow we need to come up with a
7	better way to have this suggested by our
8	folks. And if we even have to get to a point
9	where we give them some incentives to get to
10	there, very small, you know, I think that's
11	going to go a long way in our future and be
12	worth it.
13	MR. REVOLDT: Well, I think, Mark, you
14	put your finger on it, and that's subject for
15	another conversation
16	MR. CERRETA: Yeah.
17	MR. REVOLDT: after this is done. But
18	we can incentivize facades. In other words,
19	we can we can help in some fashion with a
20	facade that we approve, that meets our design
21	esthetics. And those that don't are
22	ineligible.
23	MR. YOUNG: These changes got rolled
24	into
25	MR. REVOLDT: Go ahead, Ben.

MR. YOUNG: These changes got rolled into the new draft language for 1136.09.

MR. REVOLDT: Okay. All right. Well, we'll go back and take a look. So we won't take any further action on that then.

The only other item that came up was to consider establishing a scheduled review for the zoning ordinance. One of the suggestions was that we link it to the ten-year -- a ten-year review of the master plan. But you can -- frankly, you can review the thing any time you want, just not ten years.

MR. CERRETA: We probably should make a high suggestion of how many years, though, somewhere down the line, instead of leaving it up -- this actually should be in the master plan, to be honest with you, to do this kind of thing, you know, to keep, you know, the certain areas where they are, as far as esthetics. But we probably shouldn't just leave it open to review it. We probably should have a three- to five-year kind of thing that we -- we must do it, you know, just so we are -- and that's just my opinion. I'm just throwing it out.

1	MS. WERREN: I like that. I like that,
2	too, Mark. I think things change just way
3	too quickly, with the way development has
4	been happening. It's just a good reminder
5	for everybody, keeps it in the forefront.
6	MR. FONTE: Here is the thing. This has
7	taken three years, because we waited too
8	long. That's the bottom line. It could be a
9	lot easier to make amendments and changes if
10	we check it every three to five, instead of
11	every twenty.
12	MR. REVOLDT: All right. Why don't we
13	why don't we do this then? What's your pick?
14	Three or five?
15	MS. WERREN: Three.
16	MR. FONTE: Three.
17	MR. REVOLDT: Three?
18	MS. WERREN: Three.
19	MR. STROIA: I think three, as well.
20	MR. CERRETA: It's just to review. It's
21	not like they are going to change everything.
22	MR. REVOLDT: Well, that's right. And
23	here is the other thing, too, is that will
24	get you get you in a through an
25	election and a half. So that's okay, you

1	know.
2	MS. WERREN: Well, and I like yeah,
3	well, I like the fact, too, that you have
4	maybe different eyes on it.
5	MR. REVOLDT: Absolutely.
6	MS. WERREN: You know, and the same with
7	Planning.
8	MR. REVOLDT: Yes. And, you know, again,
9	I come back to the conversation with Planning
10	Commission. I thought it was it was good.
11	Obviously, as you can see from our tally
12	sheet, we didn't agree with everything that
13	the Planning that came up at the Planning
14	Commission.
15	But, again, this was a whole range of
16	suggestions that came for members of the
17	Commission, which I thought was, you know,
18	very helpful. So if you do it every 36
19	months, it engages your Planning Commission.
20	It gives it another purpose to exist.
21	MS. WERREN: Yep.
22	MR. REVOLDT: And so okay. So three
23	is the number, correct?
24	MS. WERREN: Yep.
25	MR. FONTE: Yes.
	1

1	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. All right.
2	MAYOR WILDER: Daryl.
3	MR. REVOLDT: Yes.
4	MAYOR WILDER: Mayor Wilder. So what I
5	can do is I can suggest to the 2021 master
6	plan steering committee, this is one of your
7	suggestions from Council, that you'd like to
8	have this included in part of that master
9	plan, to try to review that every three
10	years.
11	MR. REVOLDT: Yeah. Okay. Very good.
12	MAYOR WILDER: Okay. I'll share that
13	with the committee. Okay?
14	MR. REVOLDT: Yeah.
15	MAYOR WILDER: Thank you.
16	MR. REVOLDT: And, again, I think to
17	Stephanie's point, I mean, you know, things
18	happen. I you know, we I think it's
19	just good that and I think the other thing
20	is this, is that for new members of Council,
21	you are going to get new members of your
22	Planning Commission, this is a good
23	exercise for
24	MS. WERREN: Yeah.
25	MR. REVOLDT: their instruction. You
	1

1 know, it helps familiarize them with what's 2 there, what the rationale is, et cetera. 3 It's not a bad idea. 4 Okay. Ben, I think we are done with that 5 part. 6 Okay. Finance and property. 7 Mrs. Werren. 8 MS. WERREN: Okay. So we met last 9 Friday, and we all voted to send it to the 10 auditor. And if you look at the attachments 11 that came, those numbers are in and it showed how they calculated them. And I think those 12 13 were the first four sheets. 14 And then on the next ones -- maybe six. 15 I can't remember -- it gave the actual ballot 16 language. So I don't know -- Jina, would you 17 like to say anything else about those, or ---18 or Pat? 19 MR. DEORIO: Yeah, I think -- are we --20 do we have the -- are we going -- Jina, are 21 we going to do the slides in regards to 22 following back up from the previous Committee 23 of the Whole, when we had some outstanding 24 questions that we wanted to address, or do 25 you want me to just talk about what Stephanie

just talked about? I'm not quite sure. 1 MS. ALABACK: I think we can do both. 2 MR. DEORIO: Okay. 3 I think we should -- we 4 MS. ALABACK: should probably address both. Go ahead. 5 MR. DEORIO: Well, I think we appreciate 6 Council's assistance in getting the -- the 7 right ballot language -- or the right 8 request, I should say, the right request to 9 the auditor on what we wanted them to 10 calculate. And so we learned something 11 really important on this. And this is, you 12 know, kind of the -- you know, the value of 13 14 having a good partner at the county auditor's office with Alan Harold and John Oates down 15 there. But it also goes to -- you know, talk 16 about, you know, the value of institutional 17 knowledge. And we know we have gone through 18 a lot of change in the last couple years, and 19 so we may have missed that or those before us 20 may not have had that -- had that either. 21 22 So basically what we learned in this modification that we made was that there is a 23 value to taxpayers for leaving the levies of 24 a certain vintage years on the books. 25

though they don't quite optimize based on current property values, the vantage for the taxpayer is that because the levy is at a certain age, it's subsidized by the State of Ohio. So certain residents will pay less, because the State of Ohio is going to kick in their share on the -- you know, the homestead exemption kind of thing.

So that's a good thing. And so we have had the modifications done, so that it -- we are only asking for what we need and we can make sure we don't miss on that State subsidy for the taxpayers.

Regardless of all that, though, it still leaves us where we were before, which is that, you know, we are short on funds for operating these two departments, fire and EMS. So it doesn't change that.

I think at the last meeting -- or one of the last meetings, we had to do some follow-up on some specific questions, and it related to, you know, what looked to be like a spike in 2020, and perhaps going into 2021, that it might still be elevated. So we are going to get to that.

But first we would say, you know, what will the levies be used for. Both levies are going to be for operating costs, which would be, you know, personnel, supplies, uniforms, gear, gasoline, vehicle maintenance, training, fire prevention programs. That's, you know, some top bullet points. It's operating an entire department, so there are all kinds of line items that go in those budgets, as you are well aware.

The levies will not support major capital improvements, such as the purchase of new fire engines or ambulances. These expenses will still come from the City's capital improvement budget. And grants do not support operating costs. Sometimes we get grants, as you know, for various capital things. City Council just approved one this year for the exhaust ventilation system that was installed at the -- one of the fire stations. We received a grant for that from FEMA that paid for nearly 100 percent of that.

Next slide. There were some questions as well about the -- you know, looking back, you

know, here we are going to look back ten
years to kind of see, you know, how many
fire, slash, EMS runs there are over time.
And, you know, there is a -- you can draw
this line. That would be one way to look at
it. I kind of take a look and, you know,
look at those first four years in '11, '12,
'13, and '14, and, you know, for the most
part, we -- you know, we averaged less than
2,500.

But, you know, you take a look at the most recent four years, and we are not even remotely close to 2,500. You can see that the spread on the graph is by 500 increments. So what looks to be kind of orderly is really some significant increases.

2020, we did see a reduction there. So, you know, obviously, we did transport and do things related to COVID, but for the most part, you know, there were less people out, so there were, you know, perhaps less accidents, and, you know, less, you know, incidental occurrences where EMS or fire may have to -- to respond. So we did see that reduction in -- slightly in 2020, but still

at 2,800. So this is significant.

And as we look towards, you know, continued, you know, aging of our community, those numbers will probably continue trending up. And I was surprised, Ben Young corrected me on something. You know, I thought -- you know, the stereotype is we're an aging City or aging, you know, demographic within the City. And the, you know, above 60 year old group isn't as large as I thought it was.

But as much as we are making this City such a great place to stay, they will -- we will likely all age in place here. So we may become a bigger demographic as time goes on, unless we are able to do what we have been doing -- what Council has been doing here with economic development and zoning and doing all the things to try to bring in, you know, a younger clientele.

Next slide. So in spite of the runs increasing in volume, the Chief has been trying his darnedest to keep those -- those costs per run down over time. Now, of course, it's a little bit misleading in the sense that it makes it sound like we have

total control over the cost. We don't. all depends on what the nature of the call is. So, you know, if we go through, you know, a period where -- you know, we saw the -- the runs down in 2020, but we look at

Well, you know, that's all that -- you know, there are all kinds of additional things that we have to do, we have to bring. We don't know what we are going to run into when we get there, and the use of PPE equipment or -- you know, just all kinds of other things that go into place. You know, we saw a run-up in 2020. But for the most part, the Chief has been doing a very good job of trying to keep that cost on a downward slope.

But it is a volume game. So although we are able to keep the number down, times the number of runs that are increasing, it becomes an increasingly large number for us.

Next slide. Okay. So another thing that we have been able to accomplish -- you know, and this goes back ten years. You know, it's nothing related to, you know, the current

1

2

3

4